(C.D)

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,674	04/02/2002	Shuwen Lee	2896-4006	6925

7590 05/07/2004

Morgan & Finnegan
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154

EXAMINER
TRAVERS, RUSSELL S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1617	

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/089,674	LEE, SHUWEN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Russell Travers, J.D.,Ph.D	1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

The amendment and response filed January 14, 2004 have been received and entered into the file.

Applicant's arguments filed January 14, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
>
> Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Chinese Patent no. 1129113 (CN 113), Weische ret al, Shenfeld, Pauza et al, Haines et al and Asanaka et al, of record or newly cited.

Chinese Patent no. 1129113 (CN 113) teaches methionine, silybin, vitamin B3, vitamin C, Vitamin B6, folic acid, vitamin B12, and thioctic acid, respectively (see claim 1, or table 1) as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in a dosage form. These medicaments are taught as old and well known as useful for treating viral infections, specifically HIV infections. Weische ret al teach vitamin A, vitamin B1, vitamin B6, vitamin B12, and vitamin C as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in a dosage form. These medicaments are taught as old and well known as useful for treating viral infections, specifically HIV infections. Shenfeld teaches Calcium glycerophosphate as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in a dosage form. This medicament is taught as old and well known as useful for treating viral infections, specifically HIV infections. Pauza et al teach vitamin D as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in a dosage form. This medicament is taught as old and well known as useful for treating viral infections, specifically HIV infections. Haines et al and Asanaka et al vitamin B5 as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in a dosage form. All medicaments herein claimed are taught individually, or concomitantly as useful for treating viral etiological agents specifically HIV. Claims 1-4, and the primary references, differ as to:

1) the concomitant employment of these medicaments, and

2) administration levels of the medicaments.

It is generally considered prima facie obvious to combine two, or more, compounds each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a composition which is to be used for the very same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. As shown by the recited teachings, the instant claims define nothing more than the concomitant use of conventional anti-viral agents. It would follow that the recited claims define prima facie obvious subject matter. Cf. In re Kerhoven, 626 F.2d 848, 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA 1980).

Claims 1-4 specifically require pharmaceutical compositions containing discrete medicament levels . Examiner cited prior art teaches medicaments at levels providing therapeutic effects against the etiological agent herein envisioned. These medicament levels are set forth in Chinese Patent no. 1129113 (CN 113) at figure 1 and in claim 1; by Weischer et al at page 4, lines 9-10; by Shenfeld at page 7; by Pauza et al at page 28, by Haines et al an column 7 and by Asanaka et al in the abstract. The skilled artisan would have seen conventional compositions, and the administration of these compositions in conventional manners as residing in the skilled artisan purview.

Determining the active ingredient dosage level required to effect optimal therapeutic benefit is well within the Skilled Artisan's purview, and the benefits of achieving such maximization obvious, to said skilled artisan. The claims merely recite the obvious employment of old and well known active ingredients, carriers and excipients. Thus, the only issue presented in the instant application is the obviousness of the claimed antiviral compositions.

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

Rebuttal arguments with regard to failure of CN 113 to teach all claimed ingredients are unconvincing. The instant compositions of matter are useful for any purpose, and are simply obviated by the Examiner cited prior art, not anticipated, as constructively averred herein. Those compounds taught as useful for treating HIV infections by Examiner cited prior art are seen, absent information to the contrary, as equally effective in treating HIV infections. Thus, the skilled artisan would have been motivated to employ such compounds individually, or in various mixtures, to treat HIV infections and enjoyed a reasonable expectation of therapeutic success. As set forth above, it is generally considered prima facie obvious to combine two, or more, compounds each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a composition which is to be used for the very same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. As shown by the recited teachings, the instant claims define nothing more than the concomitant use of conventional anti-viral agents. It would follow that the recited claims define prima facie obvious subject matter. Cf. In re Kerhoven, 626 F.2d 848, 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA 1980).

The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 has been considered, but is unconvincing. Examiner has neither rejected the claims for lack of utility, nor implied the instant claims fail to possess the therapeutic benefit herein claimed. To overcome an obviousness rejection the presented claims must be illustrated as possessing unexpected benefits,

over the prior art of record. In the instant declaration Applicant avers unexpected benefits residing in the claimed subject matter, yet fail to fails to set forth evidence substantiating this belief. Evidence as to unexpected benefits must be "clear and convincing" *In re Lohr*, 137 USPQ 548 (CCPA 1963), and be of a scope reasonably commensurate with the scope of the subject matter claimed, *In re Linder*, 173 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1972). The data provided by Applicants is not clear, convincing or reasonably commensurate in scope with the instant claims. Absent claims commensurate with a clear and convincing showing of unexpected benefits, or a showing reasonably commensurate with the instant claims, such claims remain properly rejected under 35 USC 103.

It is well known by the skilled artisan that carriers and excipients are employed to enhance the activity of active ingredients. Thus, the skilled artisan would expect conventional excipients and carriers to be useful concomitantly, absent information to the contrary. The instant carriers and excipients are not employed concomitantly in the prior art, thus only obviate their concomitant use.

Applicant's attention is drawn to In re Graf, 145 USPQ 197 (CCPA 1965) and In re Finsterwalder, 168 USPQ 530 (CCPA 1971) where the court ruled that when a substance is unpatentable under 35 USC 103, it is immaterial that applicant may have disclosed an obvious or unobvious further purpose or advantage for the substance.

Examiner would favorably consider claims directed to those medicaments providing unexpected therapeutic benefits, as averred herein.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). The practice of automatically extending the shortened statutory period an additional month upon the filing of a timely first response to a final rejection has been discontinued by the Office. See 1021 TMOG 35.
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Russell Travers, J.D.,Ph.D whose telephone number is 571-272-0631. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:00 to 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan, can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Russell Travers, J.D, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1617